Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

# Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 BONN 12392 01 OF 03 291839Z

43
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-13 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 H-03 OMB-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OIC-04

CU-04 RSR-01 /161 W
---------- 086907
R 291819Z AUG 73
FM AMEMBASSY BONN
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7126
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS
USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 03 BONN 12392

SHAPE FOR INTAF: GENEVA FOR DISTO AND CSCE DEL

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, GW, US
SUBJECT: MBFR: FRG FONOFF REACTION TO WORKING LEVEL
TALKS IN WASHINGTON

1. SUMMARY. DURING AUGUST 27-28 CONVERSATIONS WITH EMBOFF, FONOFF: MBFR EXPERTS RUTH AND GESCHER EXPRESSED SATISFACTION AND APPRECIATION OVER THE SERIOUS AND CONSTRUCTIVE MBFR CONSULTATIONS THEY HAD IN WASHINGTON LAST WEEK. FONOFF REPS PARTICULARLY GREETED REPORTED US READINESS TO SEEK TO NEGOTIATE, DURING MBFR-I, A SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF COMMON CEILING GOAL. GERMANS EN-DORSED US VIEW THAT JULY 27 PAPER SHOULD REPRESENT FINAL
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 BONN 12392 01 OF 03 291839Z

WESTERN AIMS RATHER THAN MERELY TACTICAL OPENING POSI-

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

TION. GERMANS ALSO WERE IMPRESSED BY US ARGUMENTATION ON RELATED ISSUES OF FBS AND MBFR AREA. FINALLY, FONOFF REPS COMMENTED ON TIMING CONSIDERATIONS, TYPE OF REDUCTIONS, VERIFICATION, TACNUCS AND DATA BASE. END SUMMARY.

2. GENERAL. RUTH AND GESCHER TOLD EMBOFF THEY APPRECIATED THE EXCELLENT MEETINGS ARRANGED FOR THEM IN STATE, DOD, ACDA AND THE WHITE HOUSE. THEY WERE PARTICULARLY GRATIFIED BY THE EVIDENT READINESS OF US OFFICIALS TO TAKE FRG CONCERNS SERIOUSLY AND TO EXPLORE WAYS TO MEET GERMAN INTERESTS TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE. RUTH AND GESCHER TOLD EMBOFF THEY THOUGHT THEIR TALKS IN WASHINGTON ALSO HAD BEEN VERY USEFUL IN CLARIFYING US VIEWS AND GOOD WILL FOR DEFENSE MINISTRY MEMBERS IN THEIR TEAM.

3. COMMON CEILING CONCEPT AND STATIONED/INDIGENOUS REDUCTION ISSUE. AS DEFENSE MINISTRY ASSISTANT SECRETARY WIECKHAD EARLIER TOLD US (BONN 11098-EXDIS), THE MAIN GERMAN CONCERN OVER THE JULY 27 US PAPER WAS WHETHER THE COMMON CEILING APPROACH COULD BE HANDLED IN SUCH A WAY TO ASSURE THAT THERE WOULD IN FACT BE A MBFR II. IT WAS THE GERMAN (AND PARTICULARLY DEFENSE MINISTRY) CONCERN THAT THE HIGHLY ASYMMETRICAL CHARACTER OF SOVIET REDUCTIONS CALLED FOR IN THE SECOND MBFR PHASE WOULD CONSTITUTE A SUBSTANTIAL DISINCENTIVE TO MOSCOW ACTUALLY ENTERING INTO MBFR II. DURING THE MONTH OF AUGUST, THE DEFENSE MINISTRY APPARENTLY STRONGLY EMPHASIZED THE POINT THAT THE JULY 27 US PAPER CALLED FOR INITIAL FIFTEEN PERCENT US/SOVIET SYMMETRICAL CUTS AS OPPOSED TO THE ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS PROVIDED FOR IN THE ORIGINAL US OPTION I. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE DEFMIN SAID IT WAS BEST TO HEDGE ON A DEFINITIVE RESOLUTION OF THE STATIONED/INDIGENOUS ISSUE UNTIL THE FRG RECEIVED SUFFICIENT CLARIFICATION FROM THE US AS TO HOW TO ASSURE THAT THERE WOULD IN FACT BE A MBFR II. THIS ISSUE, RUTH AND GESCHER SAID, PROVIDED THE PRINCIPAL MOTIVATION FOR THEIR VISIT TO WASHINGTON.

SECRET

SECRET



4. THE GERMANS BROUGHT TWO POSSIBLE PROPOSALS WITH THEM TO WASHINGTON. FIRST, THEY WONDERED WHETHER IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO RESTRUCTURE THE JULY 27 US PROPOSAL FOR MBFR PHASE I IN ORDER TO MAKE MBFR II MORE INTERESTING TO THE SOVIETS. IN PARTICULAR, BONN WAS CONSIDERING RESPECTIVE US/SOVIET FIRST PHASE REDUCTIONS OF EITHER 10-15 PERCENT OR 15-20 PERCENT, THEREBY REDUCING THE DEGREE OF SOVIET ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTION REQUIRED IN PHASE II TO REACH THE

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

704,000 COMMON CEILING. SECOND, THE FRG WONDERED WHETHER THE US WOULD AGREE TO INSIST ON A SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT DURING MBFR I NEGOTIATIONS; THIS WOULD INVOLVE THE WEST NOT SIMPLY ADVANCING THE CONCEPT BUT PRESSING HARD FOR A CONTRACT TO MAKE A CONTRACT.

5. FONOFF REPS SAY THEY HAVE NOTED THE US MESSAGE THAT THE FIRST ABOVE ALTERNATIVE (I.E., RESTRUCTURING MBFR I) WOULD BE UNACCEPTABLE TO THE US ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 BONN 12392 02 OF 03 291842Z

43
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-13 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 H-03 OMB-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OIC-04

CU-04 RSR-01 /161 W
---------- 086940
R 291819Z AUG 73
FM AMEMBASSY BONN
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7127
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS
USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 03 BONN 12392

PRESENT PROPOSAL INVOLVES A SIGNIFICANT US REDUCTION (FOR DOMESTIC PURPOSES) AS WELL AS A SUBSTANTIAL DEMAND (SOVIET TANK ARMY) ON THE USSR.

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

6. THE GERMANS ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE US WOULD NOT REPEAT NOT BE READY TO INSIST UPON SOVIET AGREEMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING GOAL AS A PRECONDITION TO MBFR I AGREEMENT. HOWEVER, THE GERMANS UNDERSTAND THAT US OFFICIALS ARE READY TO MAKE A SERIOUS AND DETERMINED EFFORT TO NEGOTIATE DURING MBFR I FOR SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF COMMON CEILING CONCEPT. ON THIS SCORE, THE GERMANS WERE PARTICULARLY IMPRESSED BY US ARGUMENTATION THAT THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT IS VERY MUCH IN THE US SELF-INTEREST, IN TERMS OF MANSFIELD PRESSURES, SOVIET MILI-TARY POSTURE AND PROVIDING OVERALL AND UNDERSTANDABLE
SECRET

SECRET



CONCEPTUAL BASIS FOR MBFR ENTERPRISE.

7. TIMING. OUR SOURCES SAY THE US/FRG TALKS LEFT OPEN AT WHAT POINT IN MBFR I THE WEST WOULD BEGIN TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE SOVIETS ON COMMON CEILING CONCEPT. FRG NOTED US ARGUMENTATION THAT SOVIETS SHOULD NOT BE PRESSED TOO SOON ON THE ISSUE BUT HOPED THE CONCEPT WILL AT LEAST BE ADVANCED BEFORE ACTUAL NEGOTIATIONS (AS OPPOSED TO INITIAL EXPLORATIONS) COMMENCE.

8. NEGOTIATING STRATEGY. AS TO US VIEW THAT ALLIED FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL SHOULD BE PRESENTED INITIALLY BEFORE CHRISTMAS, THE GERMANS SAID THEY UNDERSTOOD THIS AP-PROACH COULD BE HELPFUL VIS-A-VIS THE CONGRESS BUT THAT THE PRE-CHRISTMAS TIME TABLE STRUCK THEM AS BEING "RATHER EARLY." EMBOFF REPLIED THAT THERE WAS SOME CAUSE FOR CONCERN THAT SOVIETS MIGHT, AS IN THE VIENNA MIT, AGAIN ENGAGE IN DELAYING TACTICS. FOR THIS AND OTHER REASONS, INCLUDING ACDA DIRECTOR IKLE'S REPORTED CAUTION THAT IT WAS DANGEROUS TO ENGAGE THE SOVIETS IN THEORETICAL DISCUSSIONS OF PRINCIPLES, IT WOULD BE USE-FUL TO MOVE AT AN EARLY POINT TO CONCRETE DISCUSSIONS. COMMENT. DEPENDING UPON TENACITY OF THE BRITISH AND OTHER ALLIES, WE BELIEVE THE GERMANS ARE LIKELY TO GO ALONG WITH US WISHES ON THIS SUBJECT. END COMMENT.

9. POSSIBLE FALLBACK POSITIONS. RUTH SAID THE FRG SHARES THE US POSITION (STATE 170767, PARA 4-6) THAT PROPOSALS IN THE JULY 27 PAPER REPRESENT ACTUAL ALLIED MBFR AIMS RATHER THAN SIMPLY TACTICAL OPENING POSITIONS. EMBOFF DREW ON CITED STATE CABLE TO STRONGLY REINFORCE THIS POINT, EMPHASIZING THAT THE ALLIES WILL BE RE-QUIRED TO MAKE ENERGETIC AND TENACIOUS EFFORT TO ACHIEVE THEIR AIMS. GERMANS SAID FRG GUIDANCE FOR JULY 28 NAC GENERALLY SUPPORTED THIS US POSITION.

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

10. MBFR AREA AND FBS. FRG REPS WERE STRONGLY IMPRESSED WITH THE US ARGUMENTATION THAT CONSTRAINTS AREA SHOULD NOT REPEAT NOT BE EXTENDED BEYOND REDUCTION AREA, GIVEN THE DANGER THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD PUSH HARD FOR INCLUSION OF FBS IN MBFR. WHILE THE LONG-STANDING

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 BONN 12392 02 OF 03 291842Z

GERMAN POSITION FAVORING A WIDER CONSTRAINTS AREA HAS NOT YET BEEN CHANGED, THE GERMANS ARE ALREADY "A LOT MORE CAREFUL" ON SEEKING CONSTRAINTS OR VERIFICATION OUTSIDE THE GUIDELINES AREA, ESPECIALLY CONCERNING A POSSIBLE FREEZE. HOWEVER, THEY CONSIDER THAT CONSTRAINTS INVOLVING ONLY PRE-ANNOUNCEMENT WOULD BE A DIFFERENT MATTER. THE MAIN PROBLEM IS HOW TO TAKE THESE CONSIDERATIONS INTO ACCOUNT WHILE MEETING THE CONTINUING FRG WISH TO RELATIVIZE THE POLITICAL REPERCUSSIONS OF A LIMITED DISARMAMENT ZONE IN CENTRAL EUROPE, A POSSIBILITY WHICH CONTINUES TO ATTRACT STRONG CRITICISM FROM THE FRENCH AND THE CDU OPPOSITION.

11. TACNUC ISSUE. FONOFF REPS SAID THEY AGREED WITH THE CAUTIOUS US APPROACH ON A POSSIBLE SUPPLEMENTARY TANK/TACNUC MIXED PACKAGE. THEY WONDER WHETHER THIS POSSIBILITY MIGHT BE PRESERVED FOR MBFR II (RATHER THAN GIVEN AWAY IN MBFR I), THEREBY OFFERING ADDITIONAL INDUCEMENT TO SOVIET ENTRY INTO SECOND MBFR PHASE. THEY RECOGNIZE IT IS TOO EARLY TO MAKE A JUDGMENT ON WHETHER THIS WOULD PROVE FEASIBLE.

12. VERIFICATION. OUR SOURCES EXPRESSED UNDERSTANDING FOR THE US POSITION THAT NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS SHOULD BE THE ESSENTIAL BASIS OF MBFR VERIFICATION, BUT SAID THE FRG HAD NOT YET TAKEN A FINAL POSITION ON THE MATTER. THERE IS SOME FRG CONCERN OVER MOSCOW GAINING POLITICAL INFLUENCE VIA VERIFICATION. ON THE OTHER HAND,

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 BONN 12392 03 OF 03 291844Z

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

43
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-13 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 H-03 OMB-01 ACDA-19 AEC-11 OIC-04

CU-04 RSR-01 /161 W
---------- 086983
R 291819Z AUG 73
FM AMEMBASSY BONN
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7128
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY ROME
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS
AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
USMISSION NATO BRUSSELS
USNMR SHAPE BRUSSELS
USMISSION GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 03 OF 03 BONN 12392

SOME FRG OFFICIALS WOULD NOT BE TOO PLEASED TO RELY STRICTLY ON TECHNICAL VERIFICATION MEANS WHICH THEY DO NOT POSSESS. ONE FONOFF MBFR EXPERT PRIVATELY INQUIRED WHETHER IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE FOR OTHER ALLIES "TO TAKE PART IN USING THE TECHNICAL MEANS POSSESSED ONLY BY THE US AND THE SOVIET UNION."

13. TYPE OF REDUCTIONS. OUR SOURCES SAID THEY HAD NOT RECEIVED CLEAR ANSWERS ON AND REMAINED INTERESTED IN WHETHER THE US WOULD FAVOR THINNING OUT OF UNITS OR REDUCTION OF ENTIRE UNITS ON THE AMERICAN SIDE. THEY ALSO ARE INTERESTED IN WHICH SPECIFIC UNITS THE US MIGHT HAVE IN MIND.

14. DATA BASE. US AND FRG DEFENSE MINISTRY EXPERTS AP-
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 BONN 12392 03 OF 03 291844Z

PARENTLY DISCUSSED THE QUESTION WHETHER THE 193,000 US ARMY FORCES IN THE NATO GUIDELINES AREA INCLUDED ANY DUAL BASE FORCES. FRG WILL AWAIT FURTHER AMERICAN WORD ON THIS TOPIC AS WELL AS ON GERMAN DEFMIN THINKING ON POOLING ANALYTICAL DATA WITH US AND BRITISH EXPERTS.

15. SENIOR DEFENSE MINISTRY OFFICIALS HAVE NOT YET

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

FULLY CONSIDERED THE RESULTS OF THE FRG/US WORKING LEVEL CONSULTATIONS, BUT GESCHER TOLD EMBOFF THAT THE DEFENSE MINISTRY HAD AGREED TO THE FRG INSTRUCTION FOR AUGUST 28 NAC SESSION, TO THE EFFECT THAT AGREEMENT SHOULD BE SOUGHT IN MBFR I ON "FRAMEWORK" OF PHASE II. BONN HOPES THAT THE US WILL ALSO INDICATE IN NATO ITS READINESS TO PURSUE SUCH AN MBFR I AGREEMENT ON COMMON CEILING.
HILLENBRAND

SECRET

NNN

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

# Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994
**Channel Indicators:** n/a
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED
**Concepts:** n/a
**Control Number:** n/a
**Copy:** SINGLE
**Draft Date:** 29 AUG 1973
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960
**Decaption Note:**
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED
**Disposition Approved on Date:**
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004
**Disposition Event:**
**Disposition History:** n/a
**Disposition Reason:**
**Disposition Remarks:**
**Document Number:** 1973BONN12392
**Document Source:** CORE
**Document Unique ID:** 00
**Drafter:** n/a
**Enclosure:** n/a
**Executive Order:** GS  HILLENBRAND
**Errors:** N/A
**Film Number:** n/a
**From:** BONN
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Image Path:**
**ISecure:** 1
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t1973089/aaaaagiq.tel
**Line Count:** 340
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE
**Office:** ACTION MBFR
**Original Classification:** SECRET
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Page Count:** 7
**Previous Channel Indicators:**
**Previous Classification:** SECRET
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a
**Reference:** n/a
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED
**Review Authority:** garlanwa
**Review Comment:** n/a
**Review Content Flags:**
**Review Date:** 06 AUG 2001
**Review Event:**
**Review Exemptions:** n/a
**Review History:** RELEASED <06-Aug-2001 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <14-Sep-2001 by garlanwa>
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**
**Review Referrals:** n/a
**Review Release Date:** n/a
**Review Release Event:** n/a
**Review Transfer Date:**
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a
**Secure:** OPEN
**Status:** NATIVE
**Subject:** MBFR: FRG FONOFF REACTION TO WORKING LEVEL TALKS IN WASHINGTON
**TAGS:** PARM, GE, US
**To:** STATE
**Type:** TE
**Markings:**  Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005